

**In the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Georgia  
Waycross Division**

MANETIRONY CLERVRAIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

TRACEY JOHNS,

Defendant.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

CASE NO.: 5:18-cv-38

**ORDER**

Before the Court are motions filed by pro se Plaintiff Manetirony Clervrain: "Motion for ["Unreasonable Classification(s) Act"] by Compelling Performance Movements on Crimes Mitigating Act ('MOCMA')," dkt. no. 33; "Motion for Congressional Power and Apex Disposition Concerns by Invoking the Detainee(s) Issues Freedom Treatment Act ('DIFTA')," dkt. no. 34; "Motion for ['Opposition(s)'] or ['Criminal Intent(s)'] and/or ['Malicious'] Against Freedom of Speech(s), by the Ant(s) Freedom Act ('TAFA')," dkt. no. 35; "Motion for Consideration or Compelling Need(s) or Controversies to Litigate by Invoking the Ant(s) Duty Mitigating Act ('TADMA')," dkt. no. 36; "Motion for ['Extraordinary [sic] Remedy Act'] ('ERA') or Circumstances to Compel Process by the Ant(s) Reform Multiplicity Act ('TARMA')," dkt. no. 37; "Motion

for Mitigating Financial Burden or ('IFP') Constitutional Issues by Massive Issues ['Right Aggravated'] Treatment Act," dkt. no. 38; "Motion for Settlement Agreement(s) Against Secretive Criminals by Inkoking [sic] the National Regulatory Treaties Act ('NIRTA')," dkt. no. 39; and "Motion for ['Alien Status'] or ['Pauperis Status'] or Criteria to Consider by Invoking the ANT(s) Movement Act ('TAMA')," dkt. no. 40. Additionally, Plaintiff has filed an Amended Complaint alleging violation of his civil rights. Dkt. No. 42.

This civil action was initiated in April 2018. See Dkt. No. 1. The case was dismissed and judgment entered in March of 2019. Dkt. Nos. 12, 13. Since that time, Plaintiff has filed multiple motions that are basically unintelligible and nonsensical, all of which the Court denied. The instant filings continue in that vein. See, e.g., Dkt. No. 14 ("Motion for Administrative Records, and for a Writ of Certiorari and for Questioning Prisoners Injustice Reform Acts ('PICRA')"); Dkt. No. 16 ("Motion for Supplemental Injustice Adversely Affected ['The Ant's'], and for ['Related Mater(s)'] [sic] for Justification Act ('TAJA')"); Dkt. No. 19 ("Motion for ['Alien Status'] Or ['Pauperis Status'] or Criteria to Consider by Invoking the Ant(s) Movement Act ('TAMA')"); Dkt. No. 21 ("Motion for 'Common Sense' or Access to the Informative Legal Materials or Opposition by ['The Ant(s)'] Library Act ('TALA')"); Dkt. No. 22 ("Motion for Congressional Power and Apex


Disposition Concerns By Invoking the Detainee(s) Issues Freedom Treatment Act ('DIFTA'))"; Dkt. No. 23 ("Motion for ['Unreasonable Classification(s) Act'] by Compelling Performance Movements on Crimes Mitigating Act ('MOCMA'))"; Dkt. No. 24 ("Motion for Settlement Agreement(s) Against Secretive Criminals by Invoking [sic] the National Regulatory Treaties Act ('NIRTA'))"; Dkt. No. 25 ("Motion for Consideration or Compelling Need(s) or Controversies to Litigate by Invoking the Ant(s) Duty Mitigating Act ('TADMA'))"; Dkt. No. 26 ("Motion for ['Prompt Notices(s)'] [sic] or ['Their Expertise Act'] ('TEA'), or Opinion(s) by the National Issues Regulatory Treaties Act ('NIRTA'))"; Dkt. No. 27 ("Motion for Mitigating Financial Burden or ('IFP') Constitutional Issues by Massive Issues ['Right Aggravated'] Treatment Act"); Dkt. No. 28 ("Motion for ['Manifest Injustice Act'] (MIA) or ['Electronic Filling [sic] Act'] Opposition(s) by Secure Academic Resource Technology Act ('SARTA'))"; Dkt. No. 29 ("Motion for ['Judicial Intervention(s)'] and Clarification Necessary by Invoking the Movement(s) on Crimes Mitigating Act ('MOCMA'))".

There is in fact no discernible claim for relief and no pending litigation for which the Court need consider in forma pauperis status. To quote Judge Dudley H. Bowen, Jr. in a previous Order filed in a case involving Mr. Clervrain, "[t]he Court intuitively Plaintiff will not relent in these filings because it costs him nothing; meanwhile, the Court is wasting its resources in

docketing, considering, and resolving Plaintiff's frivolous Motions. The Court will not countenance this conduct any longer." Clervrain v. Samuel, No. 3:14cv107 (S.D. Ga. Oct. 6, 2021), Dkt. No. 43.

Upon the foregoing, Plaintiff's latest motions, dkt. nos. 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40, are **DENIED**, and his amended complaint, dkt. no. 42, is **DISMISSED**. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to refrain from accepting any other filing in this closed case absent a prescreening by the Magistrate Judge and Order that the attempted filing is intelligible and/or makes some semblance of sense.

**SO ORDERED**, this 8th day of April, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. LISA GODBEY WOOD, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA